

The Third World War

Something New Added

JAMES BURNHAM

Senator Fulbright played coy about his Memorandum on the Sins of the Military. It was just a hasty private note (like Robert Welch's *The Politician*, perhaps?) that he had scribbled to a friend at the Pentagon, he explained to fellow Senators who vainly asked if they might see a copy. No, he couldn't figure at all how that *New York Times* chap got the direct quotes and summary. But you never know about the *New York Times*, do you?



Burnham

The pose was a little too thick from a Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and close political colleague of the President, who had addressed a document on basic policy to the Secretary of Defense. The Club applied the pressure, and on August 2 Mr. Fulbright—still coyly—offered his Memo to the *Congressional Record*. "Madame President [Senator Mrs. Neuberger being in the Chair] I have been surprised by a display of intense interest in a memorandum. . . . I was unaware that the subject was one which could arouse great controversy."

The text marks a new style in congressional literature. It is novel in rhetoric and in what might be called the dialectical sophistication of the author, whoever he may be. It is novel, also, remembering the senatorial by-line, for the openness of its cynicism toward the democratic process and military mind. "It is probably the view of most Members of Congress today that if foreign aid were laid before the people in a referendum, it would be defeated. . . . Yet . . . all the paraphernalia of our international programs must be at least tolerated by the people during the 'long twilight struggle'. . . . There is little in the education, training or

experience of most military officers to equip them with the balance of judgment necessary to put their own ultimate solutions . . . into proper perspective."

Ostensibly the Memo is concerned with the formal, constitutional question of "civilian control of the military" in relation to what officers say about strategic and political issues in military institutions or public gatherings. This is mere hogwash. For years the lecture rosters of the war colleges, the reading lists of military indoctrination programs, the tables of military clubs and recreation centers, have been loaded with scores of Liberal and worse-than-Liberal speakers, books and magazines, without causing Senator Fulbright's conscience a single twitch. Nor is there any record of his having protested any of the 1,001 Liberal platitudes spouted by officers (or their ghost writers) in 10,000 lectures and articles.

Who Is the Enemy?

What, then, are Senator Fulbright & Co. really aiming at? The Memo is sprinkled with references to "right-wing radicalism." This is said to be defined by "a central thesis that the primary, if not exclusive, danger to this country is internal Communist infiltration. . . . This thesis of the nature of the Communist threat often is developed by equating social legislation with socialism, and the latter with Communism."

Now this "central thesis" is more or less that of Robert Welch, Rev. Billy James Hargis and some of their followers. When accepted in unqualified terms, it may justifiably be taken as defining a type of "right-wing radicalism." It is, moreover, when unqualifiedly put, false. But it is not a thesis that has made much headway among the military, except for a small number of retired officers to whom the Memo's strictures are not properly relevant.

A balanced reading of the Memo

reveals that this "right-wing radicalism" is a straw man. The actual target is a tendency that has been making serious headway among the military: namely, the "hard" point of view toward the Soviet Union and the International Communist enterprise, based on the premises that we are at war, and that our task is to win the war.

In the growth of this tendency, some elements of the military have been associated with the members and work of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, the Institute for American Strategy, and the Richardson Foundation (which has helped finance the two institutes). It is these institutes, and their doctrine of "protracted conflict," that are singled out by name as the Memo's Enemy.

Totalitarian Appeasement

The longest of the Memo's four attachments is a reprint of an article on these organizations published in the March issue of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*: a journal numbering among its sponsors and frequent contributors, Linus Pauling and Robert Oppenheimer.

Prof. Strausz-Hupé, the FPRA director, thus summarizes the doctrine from which the Fulbright Memo seeks to immunize our military: "In today's protracted conflict the United States must maintain and use its power for the same ultimate purpose [as Pericles pursued in Athens] protracted conflict with Sparta]: to turn the tide of battle against the Communists, to induce them to overextend themselves, to exploit the weakness of their system, to paralyze their will, and to bring about their ultimate collapse."

What we have in this Memo is a bold stroke—probably going well beyond what Senator Fulbright realizes—in a campaign, not to reassert civilian control over the military (which has been nowise in question), but to impose on all military personnel, totalitarian style, an integral appeasement ideology.

Is this Memo important? It was important enough to make the Pentagon start dancing, immediately, to its tune. It was important enough to get from the President, in his press conference of August 10, an unconditioned endorsement.